

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/542,146	Applicant(s) BARET ET AL.	
	Examiner JENNIFER K. MICHENER	Art Unit 1795	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) JENNIFER K. MICHENER. (3) Kip Werking.

(2) Tina Tai. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 28 September 2009.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: proposed claim 28.

Identification of prior art discussed: Oswald and Boeck.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discusssed proposed claim amendments. Examiner raised a possible concern about new matter and discussed clarifying language for "internal volume". Mr. Werking discussed combination of references as not teaching that the negative pressure promotes contact.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

	/Jennifer K. Michener/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1795
--	--